

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please add attached new FIG. 2A to the previously submitted drawings.

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended. Claims 36 and 37 have been added. New FIGURE 2A has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Objections to the drawings

In the March 18, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to “show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the “memory in the electronic reading device,” as recited in claim 1, needed to be shown in the drawings. Applicants have added new FIGURE 2A that shows the memory 11 of the electronic reading device 10. Support for this feature may be found at, e.g., page 14, line 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s objection is obviated.

Claim rejections

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,330,976 to Dymetman et al. (“Dymetman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,897,669 to Matsui (“Matsui”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that Dyetman teaches (a) an electronic reading system having a formatted surface [2] with an area including a specific part of an address pattern; (b) an electronic reading device [502] including a sensor [802] for detecting at least part of a specific part of the address pattern; and (c) a server [4] associated with the specific part of the address pattern for receiving a message from the electronic reading device. The Office Action indicates that Dyetman differs from claims 1 and 23 in that it does not teach “the memory adapted to store a grid description.” However, the Office Action states that FIG. 1B of Matsui teaches a memory

[36] adapted to store a grid description, and that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dyetman and Matsui in the direction of the claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites (with emphasis added):

1. An electronic reading system, comprising:
 - a formatted surface having an area that includes a specific part of an address pattern, **wherein a unique position on the address pattern can be identified from an examination of a portion of the address pattern, and the address pattern includes at least a first portion and a second portion, the first portion being assigned to a first application, and the second portion being assigned to a second application;**
 - an electronic reading device including a sensor for detecting at least a portion of the specific part of the address pattern; and
 - a server associated with the specific part of the address pattern for receiving a message from the electronic reading device, said message sent in response to said detection, and for performing a function in response to said message, **wherein the server identifies one of the first application and the second application associated with the unique position;** and
 - wherein the electronic reading device further includes a memory adapted to store a grid description, the grid description associating an action to be performed by the electronic reading device with the specific part of the address pattern.

Dyetman is directed to a system in which a user can use a pointer to capture images of portions of a document manipulated by the user. The document is described as being formed of a special type of marking medium in which a substrate, such as a sheet or sticker of paper or a document, bears visible or invisible markings that encode an identifier of the substrate and can also encode locations or cell zones with the substrate. Each of the cell zones are described as including markings such as a cell border, an indication of the orientation of the page, an encoded representation of a page-identifier, and an encoded representation of location information.

Matsui discloses an information recording medium onto which an optical readable code (referred to as a "dot code") is stored, and a reproducing system for reproducing the dot code. Matsui discloses that the reproducing system includes a memory (36) that stores dot image data from the dot code for processing.

However, neither Dyetman nor Matsui, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest that (a) a unique position on the address pattern can be identified from an examination of a portion of the address pattern, and the address pattern includes *at least a first portion and a second portion, the first portion being assigned to a first application, and the second portion being assigned to a second application*; or (b) *the server identifies one of the first application and the second application associated with the unique position*. Instead, Dyetman appears to disclose that the address pattern includes only a single portion, and use of a *single application*, not a *first and a second application*, as required by claim 1. Matsui discloses only use of an information-recording medium, and fails to disclose use of the claimed first and second portions and first and second applications.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui. Claims 2-22, 34, and 36 all depend (directly or through claim dependencies) from claim 1, and therefore also distinguish over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui, for at least the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Independent claim 23, as amended, contains the following similar distinguishing limitations: (a) first and second portions of address pattern; and (b) first and second applications. Accordingly, claims 23, and 24-33, 35, and 37 depending therefrom (either directly or through claim dependencies) also distinguish over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Moreover, new claims 36 and 37 further distinguish over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui. Specifically, new claim 36 recites (with emphasis added): “The system of claim 1, **wherein the grid description is received from an electronic client**

separate from the formatted surface.” Neither Dyetman nor Matsui disclose that a grid description is received from an electronic client separate from a formatted surface. The Office Action alleges that Matsui discloses storing a grid description in a memory. However, the only data stored in memory in Matsui is image data read directly from an *information recording medium*, not from an *electronic client*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 36 distinguishes over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui. Claim 37 contains a similar distinguishing limitation and therefore also distinguishes over Dyetman, alone or in combination with Matsui.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Chicago telephone number (312) 425-3900 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Dated: August 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By James M. Wakely
James M. Wakely

Registration No.: 48,597

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

225 West Washington Street, Suite 2600

Chicago, IL 60606

(312)455-3900

Attorney For Applicants